



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,679	02/20/2002	Dan Thaxton	STD 1067 PA	6750
<div>23368 7590 12/27/2007</div> <div>DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP</div> <div>ONE DAYTON CENTRE, ONE SOUTH MAIN STREET</div> <div>SUITE 1300</div> <div>DAYTON, OH 45402-2023</div>				
			<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>KAMAL, SHAHID</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>3621</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE</div> <div>12/27/2007</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p align="center">10/079,679</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p align="center">THAXTON, DAN</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p align="center">Shahid Kamal</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p align="center">3621</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/11/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed October 29, 2007.
2. Claims 1-20 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-7, 11, 15, and 20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Stefik et al. (US Patent No. 6,957,193 B2).

Referring to claim 1, Stefik et al. discloses processing data relating to selected security features of said document, said security features each having associated compatibility and relative rating information (see at least abstract; line 1-13, column 42, lines 30-67);

➤ revising said selected security features of said document to resolve any compatibility issues (see at least abstract; line 1-13, column 42, lines 30-67);

- evaluating said relative rating information of said selected security features to determine a document security rating of said document (see at least abstract; line 1-13, column 3, lines 53 -67, column 8, lines 18-47); and
- presenting said document security rating (see at least abstract; line 1-13, column 14, lines 33-67, column 15, lines 5-38).

Referring to claim 2, Stefik et al. discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising presenting security features for selection (col. 14, lines 48-54).

Referring to claim 3, Stefik et al. discloses the method of claim 2, wherein said security features are presented categorized by purpose (col. 14, lines 51-54).

Referring to claim 4, Stefik et al. discloses the method of claim 2, further comprising providing a selectable link for at least one said security feature, which when selected presents information which describes the associated security feature and explains strengths and weaknesses of the associated security feature (col. 14, table 2).

Referring to claim 5, Stefik et al. discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising recommending said security features based on security document type and desired security level (col. 14, table 2).

Referring to claim 6, Stefik et al. discloses the method of claim 5, further comprising providing a link for at least one of said security document type, which when selected presents an example of the associated security document type (col. 14, table 2).

Referring to claim 7, Stefik et al. discloses the method of claim 6, wherein said example includes recommended security features and providing associated links which when selected explain each associated security feature (col. 14, table 2).

Referring to claim 11, Stefik et al. discloses wherein said document security rating includes a rating of how well said selected security features will protect the security document against different forms of attack and relative ease of authentication of the security document (col. 31, lines 23-26).

Referring to claim 20, Stefik et al. discloses processing data relating to selected security features of said document, said security features each having associated compatibility and relative rating information (see at least abstract; line 1-13, col. 14, lines 48-54, col. 31, lines 23-26, and col. 14, table 2);

➤ revising said selected security features to resolve any compatibility issues (see at least abstract; line 1-13, col. 14, lines 48-54, col. 31, lines 23-26, and col. 14, table 2);

➤ evaluating said relative rating information of said selected security features to determine a document security rating; and presenting said document security rating (see at least abstract; line 1-13, col. 14, lines 48-54, col. 31, lines 23-26, and col. 14, table 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 8-10, 12-14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefik et al. (US Patent No. 6,957,193 B2) in view of Ginter et al. (US Patent No. 7,143,290 B1), and further in view of Wang (US Patent No. 6,885,748 B1).

Referring to claim 8, Stefik et al. does not expressly disclose a method of further comprising requesting document design information to help assess compatibility issues.

Ginter et al. discloses a method of further comprising requesting document design information to help assess compatibility issues (col. 11, lines 1-15, col. 19, lines 1-57, col. 40, lines 16-39).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Stefik et al. to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a great need for convenient, cost effective technique to securely handle and deliver documents and other items (Ginter: col. 1, lines 44-46).

Referring to claim 9, Stefik/Ginter et al. combination discloses said document design information includes use of security document, type of document paper, storage requirements, and threat environment assessment, and type of document shipping (Stefik: col. Lines 36, 2-9, 23-27, and col. 18, 36, lines 51-55).

Stefik/Ginter combination et al. does not expressly disclose said document design information includes use of type of document tracking, type of document authentication.

Wang however discloses said document design information includes use of type of printer type, document tracking, type of document authentication (Wang: col. 1, 4, 7 lines 42-67, 6-9, 20-23).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art modify the Stefik/Ginter combination to include Wang's steps as discussed above in order to provide a trusted system having at least one

repository for controlling use of digital works in accordance with usage rights associated with the digital works (Stefik: Abstract).

Referring to claim 10, Stefik et al. discloses the document design information (Stefik: Abstract, fig. 4, col. 18, lines 50-55).

Stefik et al. does not expressly disclose certain said security features are made unselectable.

Ginter et al. discloses certain said security features are made unselectable (Ginter: col. 4, lines 32-67).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art modify the Stefik include Ginter's steps as discussed above in order to provide a trusted system having at least one repository for controlling use of digital works in accordance with usage rights associated with the digital works (Stefik: Abstract).

Referring to claim 12, Stefik et al. does not expressly disclose said different forms of attack include tampering, copying, counterfeiting, and accessing, and said rating is provided for each attack type.

Ginter et al. discloses said different forms of attack include tampering, copying, counterfeiting, and accessing, and said rating is provided for each attack (col. 10, lines 1-39, col.13, lines 1-15, col. 37, lines 10-67).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art modify the Stefik to include Ginter's steps as discussed above in order to provide a trusted system having at least one repository for controlling

use of digital works in accordance with usage rights associated with the digital works (Stefik: Abstract).

Referring to claim 13, Ginter/Ginter et al. does not expressly disclose said authentication includes covert, and said rating is provided for each authentication type.

Wang however discloses said authentication includes covert, and said rating is provided for each authentication type (col. 1, 4, 7 lines 42-67, 6-9, 20-23).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art modify the Stefik/Ginter combination to include Wang's steps as discussed above in order to provide a trusted system having at least one repository for controlling use of digital works in accordance with usage rights associated with the digital works (Stefik: Abstract).

Referring to claim 14, Stefik et al. does not expressly disclose resolving said compatibility issue involves providing a warning, and suggesting at least two possible solutions for resolving said compatibility issue.

Ginter et al. discloses resolving said compatibility issue involves providing a warning, and suggesting at least two possible solutions for resolving said compatibility issue(col. 20, lines 6-49, col. 29, lines 23-41).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Stefik et al. to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a great need for convenient, cost effective technique to securely handle and deliver documents and other items (Ginter: col. 1, lines 44-46).

Referring to claim 16, Stefik et al. does not expressly discloses further comprising presenting a link to common questions and concerns.

Ginter et al. disclose further comprising presenting a link to common questions and concerns (Abstract, col. 11, lines 1-15, col. 20, lines 13-49).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Stefik et al. to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a great need for convenient, cost effective technique to securely handle and deliver documents and other items (Ginter: col. 1, lines 44-46).

Referring to claim 17, Stefik et al. does not expressly disclose said data relating to said selected security features.

Ginter et al. discloses said data relating to said selected security features is obtained from a database (col. 14, lines 51-54).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify of Stefik et al. to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a great need for convenient, cost effective technique to securely handle and deliver documents and other items (Ginter: col. 1, lines 44-46).

Referring to claim 18, Stefik et al. does not expressly disclose providing a protection disclaimer if said rating for at least one said attack type is deficient, and providing security feature suggestions that will provide the security document with adequate protection specified attack type area.

Ginter et al. disclose further comprising providing a protection disclaimer if said rating for at least one said attack type is deficient, and providing security feature suggestions that will provide the security document with adequate protection specified attack type area (col. 20, lines 6-49, col. 29, lines 23-41).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify of Stefik et al. to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a great need for convenient, cost effective technique to securely handle and deliver documents and other items (Ginter: col. 1, lines 44-46).

Referring to claim 19, Stefik/Ginter et al. combination discloses further comprising providing a protection disclaimer if said rating for at least one said authentication type is deficient, and providing security feature suggestions that will provide the security document with adequate protection and performance (col. 14, table 20, col. 14,18, lines 48-54, 50-55).

Ginter/Ginter et al. does not expressly disclose the specified authentication type area.

Wang however discloses the specified authentication type area (col. 3, lines 30-67, col. 4, lines 52-67).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art modify the Stefik/Ginter combination to include Wang's steps as discussed above in order to provide a trusted system having at least one

repository for controlling use of digital works in accordance with usage rights associated with the digital works (Stefik: Abstract).

9. **Examiner's Note:** The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed October 29, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. Applicant argue that Stefik et al., Ginter et al. and Wang do not disclose the present invention relates to a computer-based system for presenting a user with a comprehensive set of security features for a security document, for assisting the user through any potential incompatibilities associated with selected security features, for selecting a combination of security features for a security document, and for determining a document security rating for the document. Examples of such security features used on a security document include, but are not limited to, pantographs, screens, tamper protection, flourishes, overt authentication, and covert authentication.

The system displays a selection guide for the simple selection of desired security features for the design of a security document. After selection, the programmable computer examines those selected security features for possible incompatibilities and presents any potential problems to the user with a description of the concern.

Additionally, the software application provides to the user with a recommended course of action to resolve the concern. Finally, the system provides the user with an assessment of how well the selected security features will address the desired goal of the user for the level of security.

12. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Stefik et al., Ginter et al. and Wang disclose the present invention relates to a computer-based system for presenting a user with a comprehensive set of security features for a security document, for assisting the user through any potential incompatibilities associated with selected security features, for selecting a combination of security features for a security document, and for determining a document security rating for the document. Examples of such security features used on a security document include, but are not limited to, pantographs, screens, tamper protection, flourishes, overt authentication, and covert authentication.

The system displays a selection guide for the simple selection of desired security features for the design of a security document. After selection, the programmable computer examines those selected security features for possible incompatibilities and presents any potential problems to the user with a description of the concern.

Additionally, the software application provides to the user with a recommended course of action to resolve the concern. Finally, the system provides the user with an

assessment of how well the selected security features will address the desired goal of the user for the level of security (see at least Stefik: abstract; line 1-13, column 3, lines 53 -67, column 8, lines 18-47, column 14, table-2, Ginter: column 11, lines 1-15, column 19, lines 1-57, column 40, lines 16-39, Wang: column 1, lines 42-67, column 4, lines 6-9, column 7 lines 20-23).

Conclusion

13. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shahid Kamal whose telephone number is (571) 270-3272. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY through THURSDAY between the hours of 8:30 AM and 7 PM.


Application/Control Number:
10/079,679
Art Unit: 3621

Page 13

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for Regular/After Final Actions and 571-273-6714 for Non-Official/Draft.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shahid Kamal
November 29, 2007


ANDREW J. FISCHER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600